

are grandfathered into subsidies up to 65 percent. These are homes that were built before 1975 or when their area's flood mapping was actually done. These primary residences enjoy this subsidy, and will continue to under the current bill.

What my amendment does not do is change the insurance rates or the subsidy for those who are grandfathered into the current rate that we call pre-firm, or before flood insurance rate maps were completed; in other words, these are folks who could legitimately have said they did not know they were in a flood plain when they bought their home. I think their rates and subsidies should stay the same.

What my amendment does is make the premiums for pre-firm properties sold after this bill's enactment the same actuarial rates of homes that were built after the new mapping was complete, or post-firm. So it is a relatively simple amendment, and I think it gives more equity to the total bill by making sure all properties are eventually treated equally.

So I will provide more detail tomorrow, but I hope the chairman will consider both of those amendments because I would love to have his support.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE COOPERATION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the disposition of H.R. 3121, the House-passed Flood Insurance Act, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 275, H.R. 980, an act to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States and political subdivisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, on behalf of several of my colleagues, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wonder if consent would be granted to proceed to H.R. 980 at a time to be determined by the majority leader following consultation with the Republican leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, on behalf of several of my colleagues, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in light of these objections, I now move to pro-

ceed to Calendar No. 275, H.R. 980, and I send a cloture motion to the desk.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 275, H.R. 980, the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act.

Edward M. Kennedy, Robert Menendez, Russell D. Feingold, Patty Murray, Daniel K. Inouye, Amy Klobuchar, Debbie Stabenow, Ron Wyden, Barbara Boxer, Christopher J. Dodd, John D. Rockefeller, IV, Jon Tester, Sheldon Whitehouse, Frank R. Lautenberg, Sherrod Brown, Jeff Bingaman, John F. Kerry.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote occur on Monday, May 12, upon disposition of H.R. 3121; and that on Monday, May 12, all time after the Senate convenes until 5:30 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the mandatory quorum waived, and I withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

#### FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2007—Continued

##### AMENDMENT NO. 4731

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I understand the manager for the majority will object to me calling up, but I would like to make some remarks about it, if I might, at this time.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, if my colleague would yield, I appreciate his recognition of that. Again, our hope is something can be worked out. The objection is not based on the substance of the amendment as much as it is a question of whether the committee of jurisdiction which this matter is being considered under has raised some concerns with our colleague from South Dakota, and my hope is they can be resolved. So I would have to object if he brought up the amendment, but certainly I welcome his opportunity to talk about this amendment, and my hope is that between now and tomorrow sometime, whatever the differences are can be worked out, and we will be able to consider his amendment.

Mr. THUNE. I thank the chairman, the Senator from Connecticut, for those words. Let me, if I might, make a couple of remarks with regard to the amendment and again suggest that if at all possible, we could figure out a way to make it a part of this Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization

Act. I think it is very fitting on this bill. There are some jurisdictional issues that have been raised. But what I would like to point out is that this is a bill which obviously has a lot of important content and legislation that needs to be acted upon by the Congress, by the Senate. The amendment that Senator JOHNSON and I have offered is directly relevant to the bill because it seeks to reduce the potential impact of FEMA's revised flood map for residents of Sioux Falls, SD, which is the largest city in my State. Above all, this amendment allows the City of Sioux Falls to have the ability to advance the funds associated with the Big Sioux Flood Control Project which was authorized by the Congress in 1996.

Keep in mind, roughly 20 years ago, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers determined that the original flood control project in Sioux Falls was ineffective due to two significant flood events that occurred in 1957 and in 1969. The city and the Federal Government have been working since 2000 to raise the height of the levees and to construct a dam. However, without the authority contained in this amendment, the completion of the Big Sioux Flood Control Project will languish until the Federal Government's remaining share of the project is appropriated.

Effectively, with roughly \$21 million in remaining Federal costs and the fact that the average funding provided by Congress over the past 7 years has been about \$2 million per year, the city is at the mercy of the Federal Government to complete this important project. If these flood protection improvements are not made, roughly \$750 million in property damage could result in homes and businesses in a major flood event.

Adding to the urgency for completing this important flood control project is the fact that following Hurricane Katrina, the Federal Emergency Management Agency proposed modifications to the city's 100-year flood plain, just as FEMA has done in other communities across the country, to ensure that homeowners are aware of potential flood risks. As a result of FEMA's proposed flood plain modifications in Sioux Falls, until the Army Corps certifies completion of its project, roughly 1,600 homeowners and businesses will be required to purchase flood insurance. The quickest way to eliminate or reduce the need for flood insurance for the 1,600 homeowners and businesses is to complete construction of the Big Sioux Flood Control Project as soon as possible.

While the city has expressed a willingness to advance fund the Federal Government's remaining portion of the project, this would require Congress to act in a couple of ways. One is to allow the Army Corps to accept advance funding from the city for the Federal Government's portion of the project; second, to authorize the Army Corps to reimburse the city through future appropriations from the Federal Government's portion of the project.